

REMARKS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for granting the telephone interview on February 10, 2009.

Introduction

Claims 57-93 are pending in the application. By this Response, claims 57, 72, and 88 have been amended. All the amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Specifically, support for the amendment can be found in paragraphs 5, 7, 8-9, 37, 43, 194-197, and Figs. 2-4, and 15. Reconsideration of this application for allowance of all pending claims are hereby respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 57-61, 63-66, 71-76, 78-84 and 87-93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being rendered obvious over Lakritz U.S. Patent No. 7,207,005 filed December 5, 2002 which is a continuation of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,426 filed January 28, 1999 in view of U.S. Publication Application Publication No. 2004-0128616 filed December 28, 2002. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Based on a review of the cited primary reference Lakritz, the Applicants respectfully point out that both the motivation of the technological improvement as well as methods and systems, as claimed in the present application, significantly differ from what was taught and disclosed in Lakritz. First, the motivation for the present invention is to decouple a web server from management of multilingual web pages so that effective multilingual web page management can be achieved. The goal is to provide such management in a transparent manner without having to re-engineer the web server that is originally designed to manage a web site of a

single language. See instant disclosure, page 1, right column, paragraphs 5, 7, and 8-9. That is, the present invention aims at methods and systems that provide a user the experience of accessing web content in desired languages without adding the burden to the web server that hosts the web content in a single original language.

Lakritz aims at enhancing a web server by incorporating therein a document management system, as a part of the web server, so that the web server has the ability to provide web content in different languages to web users. See Column 3, lines 32-37. To achieve this goal, Lakritz teaches a document management method and system that has to be integrated or co-mingled with a web server. A web server that hosts web pages of an original language has to, under Lakritz, be modified or re-engineered in order to interact with the document management system taught by Lakritz. Such a modified or re-engineered web server has to interact with (co-mingle) the document management system taught by Lakritz in order to provide multilingual web pages. For example, Lakritz requires modification of a web site by creating language independent templates. See Column 6, lines 43-62, Column 7, lines 5-13, Fig. 5. In addition, under Lakritz, it is the web server that handles and maintains web pages of different languages, which evidences that web server is a part of the multilingual management. See Fig. 12, Column 12, lines 35-48. In addition, it is the web server that has to carry out manually various tasks including translation of web content from one language to the other. See Column 7, lines 24-27; Column 8, lines 4-11, 47-51; Column 11, lines 43-46; Column 12, lines 35-48.

The Applicants respectfully point out that Lakritz system and method are expressly referred to by the Applicants as undesirable solutions. The present teaching proposed methods and systems opposite of what is taught by Lakritz and aims at a multilingual system, independent of a web server, for providing multilingual web content to users based on web content in an

original language. See instant disclosure, paragraph 37 and Fig. 3. Under the present teaching, the process of providing web content in a language differing from the language hosted on the web server is transparent to the web server. The content to be translated is accessed via a publicly available means rather than proprietary means and it is much like accessing web content by an end user. See Fig. 4 of the instant disclosure. That is, there is no interaction between what is claimed and a web server and no such integration with the web server is needed. In addition, the multilingual web content to be provided to an end user is obtained via translating the publicly accessed web content in the original language to a user specified language. This translation process is also without any involvement of the web server.

The claims as presented in this instant application are directed to synchronizing content in different languages. Specifically, the claims are directed to synchronizing translated content in different languages with content in an original language hosted by a web server. That is, whenever web content in an original language, as hosted on a web server, is modified, corresponding content in a language other than the original language is to be modified accordingly. Consistently, the synchronization, as claimed, is performed independent of the web server that hosts the content in the original language. That is, the synchronization is carried out without any interaction or involvement of the web server.

On the contrary, in order to synchronize content of different languages, Lakritz's system has to totally rely on the web server and its manager to manually activate the process of re-translation to generate synchronized content in different languages. See Column 8, lines 4-11, 18-29; Column 11, lines 43-47, 50-54.

In addition, Lakritz does not disclose, teach, or suggest to translate only the portion in web content that has been modified. Rather, Lakritz teaches to re-translate each document that has been modified and this can be evidenced in the above provided citations.

Accordingly, the amended claims 57, 72, and 88 recite “accessing from a web server, via a publicly available network path, content in a first language” (i.e., no need to access content hosted on a web server via proprietary means, as in Lakritz), “determining whether each of the translatable components in the first language has a corresponding one of the translated components associated with the previous content in the second language” (i.e., the portion that has been modified is identified but Lakritz does not teach that), “translating at least a portion of at least one translatable component in the first language that does not have a corresponding translated component” (i.e., translation is applied to only the modified portion, which Lakritz does not teach), and “the steps of translating and generating are performed independent of the web server” (i.e., translation of the modified portion and creation of the synchronized content in different languages are done without any involvement of, or transparent from, the web server that hosts the original modified content).

Based on the discussed differences between the claimed invention, specifically claims 57, 72, and 88, and Lakritz, the Applicants respectfully contend that the claimed invention would not have been obvious in view of Lakritz. First, Lakritz does not teach all the limitation as recited. Second, as discussed, Lakritz’s invention is derived based on a belief (integrating a web server with a multilingual content management system is the way to go) that is opposite of what the Applicants believes (decoupling a web server from a multilingual content management system is the way to go). That is, what Lakritz teaches is precisely what the Applicants tried to avoid. Third, since method and system as disclosed by Lakritz is built for enabling a web server to be

an integral part of a multilingual content management system, they can not render the claimed systems and methods obvious because the claimed methods and systems aim at achieving exactly the opposite. Therefore, Lakritz does not render claims 57, 72, and 88 obvious.

Furthermore, none of the secondary prior art references cited remedies the deficiencies of Lakritz as identified above. That is, a combination of Lakritz with any of the secondary references can not render claims 57, 72, and 88 obvious, either. Therefore, claims 57, 72, and 88 are not obvious over Lakritz in view of Kraft and, thus, patentable.

All other claims depend from claims 57, 72, and 88, respectively. Thus, all other claims are not obvious over Lakritz in view of Kraft for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claims 57, 72, and 88 and for the additional features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejections of claims 57-93 based on U.S.C. 35, 103 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Accordingly, it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP


Stephen A. Becker
Registration No. 26,527

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:llg
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: March 23, 2009

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**